



FH

**STATE OF WISCONSIN
Division of Hearings and Appeals**

In the Matter of

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

DECISION

MPA/149252

PRELIMINARY RECITALS

Pursuant to a petition filed May 07, 2013, under Wis. Stat. § 49.45(5), and Wis. Admin. Code § HA 3.03(1), to review a decision by the Division of Health Care Access and Accountability in regard to Medical Assistance, a hearing was held on June 04, 2013, at Sheboygan, Wisconsin.

The issue for determination is whether the evidence offered on behalf of Petitioner demonstrates that a prior authorization request for oral motor feeding/swallowing evaluation meets the standards necessary for payment by the Wisconsin Medicaid program.

There appeared at that time and place the following persons:

PARTIES IN INTEREST:

Petitioner:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Respondent:

Department of Health Services
1 West Wilson Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53703

By: Theresa Walske, MS, CCC-SLP
Division of Health Care Access and Accountability
1 West Wilson Street, Room 272
P.O. Box 309
Madison, WI 53707-0309

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:

David D. Fleming
Division of Hearings and Appeals

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Petitioner is a resident of Sheboygan County.

2. A prior authorization (PA) request, dated March 1, 2013, was filed on behalf of Petitioner seeking Medicaid payment for oral motor feeding/swallowing evaluation and therapy under code 92526. Twelve sessions were requested with a cost noted to be \$2080.00.
3. Petitioner is 4 years of age (DOB 8/13/2008). Petitioner's diagnosis is conditioned dysphagia [swallowing difficulty] with a secondary diagnosis of autism.

DISCUSSION

When determining whether to approve therapy, the Department must consider the generic prior authorization review criteria listed at *Wis. Admin. Code, §DHS 107.02(3)(e)*:

(e) *Departmental review criteria.* In determining whether to approve or disapprove a request for prior authorization, the department shall consider:

1. The medical necessity of the service;
2. The appropriateness of the service;
3. The cost of the service;
4. The frequency of furnishing the service;
5. The quality and timeliness of the service;
6. The extent to which less expensive alternative services are available;
7. The effective and appropriate use of available services;
8. The misutilization practices of providers and recipients;
9. The limitations imposed by pertinent federal or state statutes, rules, regulations or interpretations, including medicare, or private insurance guidelines;
10. The need to ensure that there is closer professional scrutiny for care which is of unacceptable quality;
11. The flagrant or continuing disregard of established state and federal policies, standards, fees or procedures; and
12. The professional acceptability of unproven or experimental care, as determined by consultants to the department.

“Medically necessary” means a medical assistance service under ch. DHS 107 that is:

(a) Required to prevent, identify or treat a recipient's illness, injury or disability; and

(b) Meets the following standards:

1. Is consistent with the recipient's symptoms or with prevention, diagnosis or treatment of the recipient's illness, injury or disability;
2. Is provided consistent with standards of acceptable quality of care applicable to the type of service, the type of provider, and the setting in which the service is provided;
3. Is appropriate with regard to generally accepted standards of medical practice;
4. Is not medically contraindicated with regard to the recipient's diagnoses, the recipient's symptoms or other medically necessary services being provided to the recipient;
5. Is of proven medical value or usefulness and, consistent with s. DHS 107.035, is not experimental in nature;
6. Is not duplicative with respect to other services being provided to the recipient;
7. Is not solely for the convenience of the recipient, the recipient's family, or a provider;
8. With respect to prior authorization of a service and to other prospective coverage determinations made by the department, is cost-effective compared to an alternative medically necessary service which is reasonably accessible to the recipient; and
9. Is the most appropriate supply or level of service that can safely and effectively be provided to the recipient.

Wis. Admin. Code, §DHS 101.03(96m).

As with most public assistance benefits the initial burden of demonstrating eligibility for any particular benefit or program at the operational stage falls on the applicant, *Gonwa v. Department of Health and Family Services*, 2003 WI App 152, 265 Wis.2d 913, 668 N.W.2d 122 (Ct.App.2003). In other words, it is

a Petitioner's burden to demonstrate that s/he qualified for the requested continued services by a preponderance of the evidence. It is not the Department's burden to prove that s/he is not eligible.

Further, I note that Medicaid is meant to provide the most basic and necessary health care services at a reasonable cost to a large number of persons and must authorize services according to the Wisconsin Administrative Code definition of medical necessity and other review criteria noted above. It is not enough to demonstrate a benefit; rather, all of the tests cited above must be met.

The provider requested authorization for ST under Code 92526, Treatment of Swallowing Dysfunction and/or Oral Motor Function for Feeding. The Department's Therapy Handbook, Appendix 10, requires the following for approval:

The recipient must have an identified physiological swallowing and/or feeding problem. This is to be documented using professional standards of practice such as identifying oral phase, esophageal phase or pharyngeal phase dysphagia, baseline of current swallowing and feeding skills not limited to signs of aspiration, an oral mechanism exam, report of how nutrition is met, current diet restrictions, compensation strategies used, and level of assistance needed.

The provider argues that there is no definition of 'feeding problem' in ForwardHealth literature and that Petitioner's autism is a health condition that is causing a disruption in the normal function of eating which then qualifies as a feeding disorder and allows Medicaid payment for the requested therapy.

Nonetheless, Department policy is clear with no exceptions; Code no. 92526 cannot be approved unless there is a physiological basis for the swallowing problem or the feeding problem. Here Petitioner's ability to chew and swallow are normal. There is no indication of physical abnormality. Rather the nature of the problem seems to be a combination of sensory, developmental and/or behavioral issues possibly related to his autism. The Division of Hearings and Appeals cannot simply ignore the policy and create its own coverage standards - even if it is generally agreed that the service will be useful or even necessary. The Division of Hearings and Appeals must affirm the denial of the services.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Department correctly denied oral motor feeding/swallow therapy because Petitioner has no physiological barrier to oral feeding.

NOTE: Petitioner's family should be aware that Petitioner's provider will not receive a copy of this Decision. If the family wishes the provider to have a copy, the family must provide a copy to the provider.

THEREFORE, it is

ORDERED

That this appeal is dismissed.

REQUEST FOR A REHEARING

This is a final administrative decision. If you think this decision is based on a serious mistake in the facts or the law, you may request a rehearing. You may also ask for a rehearing if you have found new evidence which would change the decision. Your request must explain what mistake the Administrative

Law Judge made and why it is important or you must describe your new evidence and tell why you did not have it at your first hearing. If you do not explain these things, your request will have to be denied.

To ask for a rehearing, send a written request to the Division of Hearings and Appeals, P.O. Box 7875, Madison, WI 53707-7875. Send a copy of your request to the other people named in this decision as "PARTIES IN INTEREST." Your request for a rehearing must be received no later than 20 days after the date of the decision. Late requests cannot be granted.

The process for asking for a rehearing is in Wis. Stat. § 227.49. A copy of the statutes can be found at your local library or courthouse.

APPEAL TO COURT

You may also appeal this decision to Circuit Court in the county where you live. Appeals must be served and filed with the appropriate court no more than 30 days after the date of this hearing decision (or 30 days after a denial of rehearing, if you ask for one).

For purposes of appeal to circuit court, the Respondent in this matter is the Department of Health Services. After filing the appeal with the appropriate court, it must be served on the Secretary of that Department, either personally or by certified mail. The address of the Department is: 1 West Wilson Street, Madison, Wisconsin 53703. A copy should also be sent to the Division of Hearings and Appeals, 5005 University Avenue, Suite 201, Madison, WI 53705-5400.

The appeal must also be served on the other "PARTIES IN INTEREST" named in this decision. The process for appeals to the Circuit Court is in Wis. Stat. §§ 227.52 and 227.53.

Given under my hand at the City of Milwaukee,
Wisconsin, this 29th day of July, 2013

\sDavid D. Fleming
Administrative Law Judge
Division of Hearings and Appeals



State of Wisconsin\DIVISION OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

Wayne J. Wiedenhoeft, Acting Administrator
Suite 201
5005 University Avenue
Madison, WI 53705-5400

Telephone: (608) 266-3096
FAX: (608) 264-9885
email: DHAmail@wisconsin.gov
Internet: <http://dha.state.wi.us>

The preceding decision was sent to the following parties on July 29, 2013.

Division of Health Care Access And Accountability